

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICARDO BANUELOS,

Defendant.

2:07-CR-137 JCM (RJJ)

ORDER

Presently before the court is petitioner Ricardo Banuelos’s letter requesting the status of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. (Doc. # 113). Although letters to the court are usually disregarded, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7 (a document requesting a court order must be styled as a motion, not a letter), the court makes an exception under these circumstances.

The government filed a motion for leave to file a late response to petitioner’s 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion (doc. # 107) and the court granted the motion (doc. # 108). Subsequently, the government timely complied with the extension of time. (*See* doc. # 109). The court then granted petitioner an extension of time to file his reply. (Doc. # 112). Petitioner then filed the instant letter. (Doc. # 113).

...
...
...
...

1 Because this letter indicates that petitioner has not received the court's order granting
2 defendant the initial extension of time of reply;¹ the court finds that an additional thirty (30) day
3 extension of time is warranted.

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that petitioner shall have up
5 to and including November 24, 2012, to file a reply to the government's response.

6 DATED October 23, 2012.

7
8 
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ It appears that manual distribution in this case has caused some delay in communication between the parties and the court.